



\$~49

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 4212/2026**

**K M KARTHIK**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhishek Yadav, Ms. Komal  
Bharti and Mr. Tushar Bagga, Advs,

versus

**UNION OF INDIA & ANR.**

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Neha Rastogi SPC with Mr.  
Animesh Rastogi, Mr. Rajat Dubey,  
Ms. Kanchan Semwal, GPs.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV**

**ORDER**

% **01.04.2026**

1. The instant petition is for the following reliefs:

*“a. Issue a writ in nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, to adjudicate the Petitioner's RTI related 11.10.2022 and CIC order dated 27.03.2024 and 15.04.2025.*

*b. Issue a writ, order, or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper to ensure that a fair, just and unbiased adjudication with respect to complaint instituted by the Petitioner before the Respondent No.2*

*c. Pass any other writ, order, or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.”*

2. The petitioner on 11.10.2022 filed an application before the Animal Welfare Board of India seeking certain information.

3. *Vide* reply dated 03.11.2022, the Assistant Secretary, Public Information Officer of the Animal Welfare Board of India, informed the petitioner that the information was not available with them.



4. The petitioner thereafter on 19.11.2022 preferred a First Appeal with the Secretary, Animal Welfare Board of India at Haryana.
5. The Appellate Authority *vide* letter dated 30.12.2022 dismissed the appeal holding that the Central Public Information Officer (CPIO) has furnished the relevant information.
6. Assailing the aforesaid decisions, a second appeal was preferred before the Central Information Commission (CIC), and *vide* order dated 27.03.2024, the CIC had directed the CPIO, Ms. Prachi Jain to show cause as to why penal proceedings should not be initiated against her.
7. *Vide* order dated 15.04.2025, the CIC noted that the Board had replied to the Right to Information application dated 03.11.2022 stating that the Board has not received any information from the District Administration regarding the action taken on the letters dated 08.07.2022 and 26.08.2022 till that date.
8. The proceedings for final election, however, were dropped on being satisfied by the cause shown by Ms. Prachi Jain.
9. The petitioner raises a grievance that the CIC found that the district administration did not take any action pursuant to letters dated 08.07.2022 and 26.08.2022. The CIC ought to have taken the issue to its logical conclusion.
10. Keeping in mind the said submissions, the Court finds that there is nothing on record to indicate that the letters dated 08.07.2022 and 26.08.2022 are taken to their logical conclusion.
11. If the petitioner has not received any information pursuant to those letters, the CIC should have dealt with the issue accordingly.
12. For all those reasons, the Court finds that the primary grievance of the



petitioner with respect to non furnishing of the information *qua* letters dated 08.07.2022 and 26.08.2022 has not been adequately dealt with.

13. In view thereof, the matter is directed to be remitted back to the CIC for reconsideration of the petitioner's grievance. If the petitioner approaches to the CIC, let his grievance be dealt with in accordance with law within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of the order passed today.

14. With the aforesaid observations, the instant petition stands disposed of.

**PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J**

**APRIL 1, 2026/Sh**